



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/802,351	03/16/2004	Stephen R. Payne	TRA-128	3625
20/028 7590 09/25/2009 Lipsitz & McAllister, LLC 755 MAIN STREET MONROE, CT 06468				
EXAMINER				
MCLEAN, NEIL R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2625				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/25/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/802,351

**Applicant(s)**

PAYNE, STEPHEN R.

**Examiner**

Neil R. McLean

**Art Unit**

2625

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 September 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,6-21 and 25-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,6-21 and 25-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/08/2009
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments, see Amendment After Final, filed 9/11/2009, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1, 2, 6-21, and 25-40 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Schwier et al.

### ***Status of Claims***

2. Claims 1, 2, 6-21, and 25-40 are pending in this application.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Regarding Applicant's Argument: (page 2, lines 4-6)

"...neither Mokuya nor Gauthier disclosed providing template attributes to memory of a printer and creating at the printer a template from the template attributes in response to received data, as claimed by the Applicant."

#### **Examiners Response:**

Gauthier does not disclose creating the template at the printer from the template attributes in response to received print data.

Schwier discloses creating the template at the printer from the template attributes in response to received print data (The variable data, in contrast, together with all needed characteristics (for example, indications of position on the individual document, color particulars, font particulars) are separately transmitted, likewise to the printer device. The transmission of the variable data and of the static data from the computer system 1 to the printer device 7 can ensue via the same data line, whereby, however, a logical discrimination (separability) between the data must be retained. Within the printer device 7, the received, variable data are mixed again with the static data and printed as disclosed in Figure 2 and described at Column 6, lines 49-64). Schwier & Gauthier are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor of image processing; e.g., both references disclose methods of combining document data at a printer. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to create the template at the printer from the template attributes in response to received print data. The suggestion/motivation for doing so is to save time as disclosed by Schwier in the Summary of Invention. Schwier further discloses that when documents contain the same information, that it is redundant to repeatedly send the same information over and over again. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Schwier's method of joining print data in the printer with Gauthier's printer apparatus to obtain the invention as specified to get a faster print-out of a merged document.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 6-8, 10-15, 18-20, and 25-27, 29-34, and 37-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gauthier (US 2002/0122205) in view of Schwier et al. (US 7,202,972) hereinafter 'Schwier'.

Regarding Claim 1: (previously presented)

Gauthier discloses a method for configuring a template (e.g., Processing variable data wherein once defined, the template and graphics states for a page can be stored and reused for printing subsequent pages as described in [0008], lines 4-7) for a printer, comprising:

providing template attributes to memory of the printer (See Template Storage 28 in Figure 1);

receiving print data into the printer memory (e.g., After the PostScript file 11 is generated, it is transferred from the workstation 10 to printer 12 in Figure 1);

creating at the printer a template from the template attributes in response to received print data (As the PostScript interpreter 14 executes, it defines the PostScript graphics state attributes for the page. These attributes can include the size, font, position, orientation, and location in which the graphic or text data is to appear on the page as described in [0025], lines 1-5).

merging (e.g., A control task operates in the printer 12 to initiate the PostScript interpreter program 14 and a merge task 16 as described in [0024], lines 4-7) the print data into the template to create a composite image (In the printer 12, a PostScript interpreter 14 is executed to generate a pagemap of the image as described in [0024], lines 3-4); and

printing the composite image on a substrate (e.g., When a bit map has been generated for each variable data area, and merged with the template 28, the pagemap is output for printing as shown at 29 of Figure 1 and described in [0043], lines 4-6).

Gauthier does not disclose creating the template at the printer from the template attributes in response to received print data.

Schwier discloses creating the template at the printer from the template attributes in response to received print data (The variable data, in contrast, together with all needed characteristics (for example, indications of position on the individual document, color particulars, font particulars) are separately transmitted, likewise to the printer device. The transmission of the variable data and of the static data from the computer system 1 to the printer device 7 can ensue via the same data line, whereby, however, a logical discrimination (separability) between the data must be retained. Within the printer device 7, the received, variable data are mixed again with the static data and printed as disclosed in Figure 2 and described at Column 6, lines 49-64). Schwier & Gauthier are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor of image processing; e.g., both references disclose methods of combining document data at a printer. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to create the template at the printer from the template attributes in response to received print data. The suggestion/motivation for doing so is to save time as disclosed by Schwier in the Summary of Invention. Schwier further discloses that when documents contain the same information, that it is redundant to repeatedly send the same information over and over again. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Schwier's method of joining print data in the printer with Gauthier's printer apparatus to obtain the invention as specified to get a faster print-out of a merged document.

Regarding Claims 3-5: (Cancelled)

Regarding Claim 6: (Original)

Gauthier further discloses the method in accordance with claim 1, wherein:

the template attributes are provided by a host system associated with the printer

(As shown in FIG. 1, an image containing text and/or graphics data is created at a workstation 10).

Regarding Claim 7: (Original)

Gauthier further discloses the method in accordance with claim 6, wherein:

the template attributes are input via a user interface associated with the host

system (e.g., As shown in FIG. 1, an image containing text and/or graphics data is created at a workstation 10, using a graphics application program such as Adobe Illustrator.RTM.. As the image is created, the application program displays the image on the workstation screen. When the image is complete and ready to be printed as a page, the application program generates a specification of the image in PostScript in a conventional manner as described in [0023]).

Regarding Claim 8: (Currently Amended)

Gauthier discloses a method for configuring a template for a printer (e.g., Processing variable data wherein once defined, the template and graphics states for a page can be stored and reused for printing subsequent pages as described in [0008], lines 4-7), comprising:

receiving print data into the printer memory (e.g., After the PostScript file 11 is generated, it is transferred from the workstation 10 to printer 12 in Figure 1);

creating at the printer a template for the received print data from the template attributes (As the PostScript interpreter 14 executes, it defines the PostScript graphics state attributes for the page. These attributes can include the size, font, position, orientation, and location in which the graphic or text data is to appear on the page as described in [0025], lines 1-5);

merging (e.g., A control task operates in the printer 12 to initiate the PostScript interpreter program 14 and a merge task 16 as described in [0024], lines 4-7) the received print data into the template to create a composite image (In the printer 12, a PostScript interpreter 14 is executed to generate a pagemap of the image as described in [0024], lines 3-4); and

printing the composite image on a substrate (e.g., When a bit map has been generated for each variable data area, and merged with the template 28, the pagemap is output for printing as shown at 29 of Figure 1 and described in [0043], lines 4-6).

Gauthier does not disclose creating the template at the printer from the template attributes in response to received print data.

Schwier discloses creating the template at the printer from the template attributes in response to received print data (The variable data, in contrast, together with all needed characteristics (for example, indications of position on the individual document, color particulars, font particulars) are separately transmitted, likewise to the printer device. The transmission of the variable data and of the static data from the computer system 1 to the printer device 7 can ensue via the same data line, whereby, however, a logical discrimination (separability) between the data must be retained. Within the printer device 7, the received, variable data are mixed again with the static data and printed as disclosed in Figure 2 and described at Column 6, lines 49-64). Schwier & Gauthier are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor of image processing; e.g., both references disclose methods of combining document data at a printer. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a



person of ordinary skill in the art to create the template at the printer from the template attributes in response to received print data. The suggestion/motivation for doing so is to save time as disclosed by Schwier in the Summary of Invention. Schwier further discloses that when documents contain the same information, that it is redundant to repeatedly send the same information over and over again. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Schwier's method of joining print data in the printer with Gauthier's printer apparatus to obtain the invention as specified to get a faster print-out of a merged document.

6. Claims 9 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gauthier and Schwier and further in view of Leone et al. (US 2003/0002081) hereinafter 'Leone'.

Regarding Claim 9: (Original)

Gauthier and Schwier disclose substantially the invention as claimed above in accordance with claim 8, however Gauthier & Schwier do not expressly disclose wherein:

The removable memory device comprises one of a compact flash card, a smart card, a smart media card, a USB flash drive, a memory stick, or a plug in serial EEPROM.

Leone discloses wherein the removable memory device comprises one of a compact flash card, a smart card, a smart media card, a USB flash drive, a memory stick, or a plug in serial EEPROM (portable memory device 14 of Figure 1; [0029] – [0034]).

Gauthier, Schwier and Leone are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor of image processing; e.g., all three references disclose methods of combining data stored in a printing apparatus. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate alternative types of portable memory devices for use in a printing apparatus. The suggestion/motivation for doing so is to avoid the inconvenience of hooking up cables as disclosed by Leone in the Background of Invention. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gauthier, Schwier and Leone to obtain the invention as specified.

Regarding Claims 27 and 28:

Claims 8 and 9 teaches the method. Claims 27 and 28 are obvious over Gauthier, Schwier, and Leone because the apparatus is achieved using the method steps of Claims 8 and 9.

Regarding Claim 10: (Original)

Gauthier further discloses the method in accordance with claim 1, wherein:  
the template attributes comprise at least one of number of print fields, print field position, print field area, print position, font style, bold font, italic font, underline text, font size, characters per inch, text orientation, image position, image size, print resolution,

barcode type, and color (These attributes can include the size, font, position, orientation, and location in which the graphic or text data is to appear on the page as described in [0025], lines 1-5).

Regarding Claim 11: (Original)

Gauthier further discloses the method in accordance with claim 1, wherein:

said template contains a number of print fields (The merge task 16 retrieves the names of the data fields which are associated with the selected template as described in [0038]; e.g., In the representative merge file 20 shown in FIG. 1, the field names are NAME and NUMBER).

Regarding Claim 12: (Original)

Gauthier further discloses the method in accordance with claim 11, wherein:

the number of print fields is configurable (e.g., As the PostScript attributes are defined, they are placed in a stack. When a new attribute is defined, it is added to the top of the stack. When an attribute is deleted, it is removed from the stack. The combination of all of the attributes located in the stack at any point during the execution of the PostScript interpreter 14 constitutes the "current" graphics state for the page as described in [0028]).

Regarding Claim 13: (Original)

Gauthier further discloses the method in accordance with claim 11, further comprising:

providing template attributes for each print field (e.g., As the PostScript attributes are defined, they are placed in a stack. When a new attribute is defined, it is added to the top of the stack. When an attribute is deleted, it is removed from the stack. The combination of all of the attributes located in the stack at any point during the execution of the PostScript interpreter 14 constitutes the "current" graphics state for the page as described in [0028]).

Regarding Claim 14: (Original)

Gauthier further discloses the method in accordance with claim 1, wherein:  
the print data comprises at least one of text and graphics (As shown in FIG. 1, an image containing text and/or graphics data is created at a workstation 10).

Regarding Claim 15: (Original)

Gauthier further discloses the method in accordance with claim 1, wherein:  
the print data is forwarded from a host system associated with the printer (e.g., After the PostScript file 11 is generated, it is transferred from the workstation 10 to a printer generally designated as 12).

Regarding Claim 18: (Original)

Gauthier further discloses the method in accordance with claim 1, wherein:  
said template attributes include delimiting characters for separating print field data (e.g., the name is enclosed within brackets in the file, such as "<<>>", to enable the control task to identify the data as defining a graphics state rather than being an ordinary data string. Thus, to define the graphics state "ADDRESS" within the PostScript file 11, the following would appear before a show command in the code: "(<<ADDRESS>>)" as described in [0031]).

Regarding Claim 19: (Original)

Gauthier further discloses the method in accordance with claim 18, wherein: said delimiting characters are configurable (e.g., the name is enclosed within brackets in the file, such as "<<>>", to enable the control task to identify the data as defining a graphics state rather than being an ordinary data

string. Thus, to define the graphics state "ADDRESS" within the PostScript file 11, the following would appear before a show command in the code: "<<ADDRESS>>)" as described in [0031]).

Regarding Claim 20: (Currently Amended)

Gauthier discloses a printer having a configurable template (e.g., Processing variable data wherein once defined, the template and graphics states for a page can be stored and reused for printing subsequent pages as described in [0008], lines 4-7), comprising:

memory (e.g., After the PostScript file 11 is generated, it is transferred from the workstation 10 to printer 12 in Figure 1) for storing received template attributes (e.g., Utilizing variable data with a page description language, which enables the template and graphics states for a page of variable data to be defined and stored and which enables the stored graphics states to be associated with multiple items of variable data from a database or merge file as described in [0009], lines 1-6) and received print data;

a processor for creating a template from the template attributes and merging the print data into the template to create a composite image (e.g., The method of the present invention is implemented by means of a control task which executes in conjunction with a page description code interpretive program, such as a PostScript program, to identify variable data areas in the page description code specification, and reserve the graphics states for the variable data areas as they are defined by the specification. After the interpreter program has executed, a merge task is initiated. The merge task associates items of variable data from a data file with the reserved graphics states, generates a bit map for each variable data area, merges the bit maps with the page template, and outputs a complete bit map for the page as described in [0010]); and

printing means for printing the composite image on a substrate (e.g., When a bit map has been generated for each variable data area, and merged with the template 28, the pagemap is output for printing as shown at 29 of Figure 1 and described in [0043], lines 4-6).

Gauthier does not disclose creating the template at the printer from the template attributes in response to received print data.

Schwier discloses creating the template at the printer from the template attributes in response to received print data (The variable data, in contrast, together with all needed characteristics (for example, indications of position on the individual document, color particulars, font particulars) are separately transmitted, likewise to the printer device. The transmission of the variable data and of the static data from the computer system 1 to the printer device 7 can ensue via the same data line, whereby, however, a logical discrimination (separability) between the data must be retained. Within the printer device 7, the received, variable data are mixed again with the static data and printed as disclosed in Figure 2 and described at Column 6, lines 49-64). Schwier & Gauthier are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor of image processing; e.g., both references disclose methods of combining document data at a printer. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to create the template at the printer from the template attributes in response to received print data. The suggestion/motivation for doing so is to save time as disclosed by Schwier in the Summary of Invention. Schwier further discloses that when documents contain the same information, that it is redundant to repeatedly send the same information over and over again. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Schwier's method of joining print data in the printer with Gauthier's printer apparatus to obtain the invention as specified to get a faster print-out of a merged document.

Regarding Claims 22-24: (Canceled)

Regarding Claim 25: (Original)

Gauthier further discloses the printer in accordance with claim 20, wherein:  
the template attributes are provided by a host system associated with the printer  
(As shown in FIG. 1, an image containing text and/or graphics data is created at a workstation 10).

Regarding Claim 26: (Original)

Gauthier further discloses the printer in accordance with claim 25, wherein:  
the template attributes are input via a user interface associated with the host  
system (e.g., As shown in FIG. 1, an image containing text and/or graphics data is created at a workstation 10,  
using a graphics application program such as Adobe Illustrator.RTM.. As the image is created, the application  
program displays the image on the workstation screen. When the image is complete and ready to be printed as a  
page, the application program generates a specification of the image in PostScript in a conventional manner as  
described in [0023]).

Regarding Claim 29: (Original)

Gauthier further discloses the printer in accordance with claim 20, wherein:  
the template attributes comprise at least one of number of print fields, print field  
area, print position, font style, bold font, italic font, underline text, font size, characters  
per inch, text orientation, image position, image size, print resolution, barcode type, and  
color (These attributes can include the size, font, position, orientation, and location in which the graphic or text data  
is to appear on the page as described in [0025], lines 1-5).

Regarding Claim 30: (Original)

Gauthier further discloses the printer in accordance with claim 20, wherein:

said template contains a number of print fields (e.g., the merge task 16 retrieves the names of the data fields which are associated with the selected template as described in [0038]; In the representative merge file 20 shown in FIG. 1, the field names are NAME and NUMBER).

Regarding Claim 31: (Original)

Gauthier further discloses the printer in accordance with claim 30, wherein:

the number of print fields is configurable (e.g., As the PostScript attributes are defined, they are placed in a stack. When a new attribute is defined, it is added to the top of the stack. When an attribute is deleted, it is removed from the stack. The combination of all of the attributes located in the stack at any point during the execution of the PostScript interpreter 14 constitutes the "current" graphics state for the page as described in [0028]).

Regarding Claim 32: (Original)

Gauthier further discloses the printer in accordance with claim 30, wherein:

template attributes are provided for each print field (e.g., As the PostScript attributes are defined, they are placed in a stack. When a new attribute is defined, it is added to the top of the stack. When an attribute is deleted, it is removed from the stack. The combination of all of the attributes located in the stack at any point during the execution of the PostScript interpreter 14 constitutes the "current" graphics state for the page as described in [0028]).

Regarding Claim 33: (Original)

Gauthier further discloses the printer in accordance with claim 20, wherein:

the print data comprises at least one of text and graphics (As shown in FIG. 1, an image containing text and/or graphics data is created at a workstation 10).

Regarding Claim 34: (Original)



Gauthier further discloses the printer in accordance with claim 20, wherein:

the print data is forwarded from a host system associated with the printer (e.g., After the PostScript file 11 is generated, it is transferred from the workstation 10 to a printer generally designated as 12).

Regarding Claim 37: (Original)

Gauthier further discloses the printer in accordance with claim 20, wherein:

said template attributes include delimiting characters for separating print field data (e.g., the name is enclosed within brackets in the file, such as "<<>>", to enable the control task to identify the data as defining a graphics state rather than being an ordinary data string. Thus, to define the graphics state "ADDRESS" within the PostScript file 11, the following would appear before a show command in the code: "<<ADDRESS>>" as described in [0031]).

Regarding Claim 38: (Original)

Gauthier further discloses the printer in accordance with claim 37, wherein:

said delimiting characters are configurable (e.g., the name is enclosed within brackets in the file, such as "<<>>", to enable the control task to identify the data as defining a graphics state rather than being an ordinary data string. Thus, to define the graphics state "ADDRESS" within the PostScript file 11, the following would appear before a show command in the code: "<<ADDRESS>>" as described in [0031]).

Regarding Claim 39: (New)

Gauthier further discloses the method in accordance with claim 1, further comprising:

verifying all template fields are complete prior to printing the composite image

(The merge task 16 then continues processing in this manner until bit maps have been generated and merged into

the template for all of the graphics states reserved for the page. After all of the bit maps for the second page have been merged into the template, the page is printed. The merge task 16 continues, repeating these steps for each record of data in the merge file 20, until all of the variable data records have been printed on a page); and

if the template fields are not complete, monitoring communications from a host computer(Workstation 10) until additional print data is received and all template fields are complete (The Examiner perceives that the monitoring means is inherently contained in the workstation. Applicant argues that the monitoring necessarily occurs at the printer to which the Examiner respectfully disagrees and believes that at [0045] where Gauthier discloses that the merging continues until all of the records have been printed on a page inherently contains a means to monitor the printer until all of the template fields are complete.)

Regarding Claim 40: (New)

Gauthier further discloses the printer in accordance with claim 20, further comprising:

means for verifying all template fields are complete prior to printing the composite image (The merge task 16 then continues processing in this manner until bit maps have been generated and merged into the template for all of the graphics states reserved for the page. After all of the bit maps for the second page have been merged into the template, the page is printed. The merge task 16 continues, repeating these steps for each record of data in the merge file 20, until all of the variable data records have been printed on a page);

means for monitoring communications from a host computer (Workstation 10);

wherein, if the template fields are not complete, the means for monitoring monitors the communications from the host computer until additional print data is received and all template fields are complete (The Examiner perceives that the monitoring means is inherently contained in the workstation. Applicant argues that the monitoring necessarily occurs at the printer to which the Examiner respectfully disagrees and believes that at [0045] where Gauthier discloses that the merging

continues until all of the records have been printed on a page inherently contains a means to monitor the printer until all of the template fields are complete.)

7. Claims 2, 16-17, 21 and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gauthier in view of Schwier as applied to claims 1 and 20 above, and further in view of Sansone (US 6,373,587).

Regarding method Claim 2 and similar printer Claim 21:

Gauthier in view of Schwier disclose the method and apparatus in accordance with claims 1 and 20.

Gauthier in view of Schwier do not disclose expressly wherein said printer comprises a ticket printer; and said substrate comprises a ticket.

Sansone discloses wherein said printer comprises a ticket printer; and said substrate comprises a ticket (FIG. 1, the reference character 11 represents an electronic ticket that may be used for admission to any place, service, or event that current tickets allow admission. Electronic ticket 11 may have been produced by a printer coupled to a computer or by a printer of an electronic postage meter or automatic teller machine (ATM) printer as disclosed in Column 2, line 66 – Column 3, line 4).

Sansone & Gauthier in view of Schwier are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor of image processing; e.g., all references disclose methods of printing to static and variable text/graphic fields. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have a printer which comprises a ticket printer. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would be because tickets have variable text and data fields for the e.g., event and seat numbers, and it

would be advantageous for the user to print a ticket on a printer. The user can obtain a ticket without having to go to a different location such as an airport or a concert venue or wait for the ticket to be delivered. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sansone's method for printing electronic tickets with Gauthier and Schwier's method and apparatus of merging data at a printer to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 2 and Claim 21.

Regarding method Claims 16 and 17, and similar printer Claims 35-36:

Gauthier in view of Schwier disclose the method and apparatus in accordance with claims 1 and 20.

Gauthier in view of Schwier do not disclose expressly wherein the host system comprises one of a cash register, a point of sale terminal, a slot machine, a gaming terminal, a lottery ticket machine, a transportation ticket vending machine, or an entertainment ticket vending machine; and

wherein the substrate comprises one of a receipt, a lottery ticket, a coupon, a bus ticket, an airplane ticket, a train ticket, a gaming voucher, or a slot machine voucher.

Sansone discloses wherein the host system comprises one of a cash register, a point of sale terminal, a slot machine, a gaming terminal, a lottery ticket machine, a transportation ticket vending machine, or an entertainment ticket vending machine (e.g.,

Electronic ticket 11 may have been produced by a printer coupled to a computer or by a printer of an electronic postage meter or automatic teller machine (ATM) printer as described in Column 3, lines 1-4); and

wherein the substrate comprises one of a receipt, a lottery ticket, a coupon, a bus ticket, an airplane ticket, a train ticket, a gaming voucher, or a slot machine voucher (e.g.,

FIG. 1, the reference character 11 represents an electronic ticket that may be used for admission to any place, service, or event that current tickets allow admission. Electronic ticket 11 may have been produced by a printer coupled to a computer or by a printer of an electronic postage meter or automatic teller machine (ATM) printer as described in Column 2, line 66 – Column 3, line 4).

Sansone & Gauthier in view of Schwier are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor of image processing; e.g., both references disclose methods of printing to static and variable text/graphic fields. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have a printer which comprises a ticket printer and to print to a ticket.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would be because tickets have variable text and data fields for the e.g., event and seat numbers, and it would be advantageous for the user to print a ticket on a printer. The user can obtain a ticket without having to go to a different location such as an airport or a concert venue or wait for the ticket to be delivered. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sansone's method for printing electronic tickets with Gauthier and Schwier's method and apparatus of merging data at a printer to obtain the invention as specified in Claims 16 and 17, and similar printer Claims 35-36.

### ***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Dziesietnik et al. (US 6,134,018) discloses a method and apparatus for printing variable data.

***Examiner Notes***

8. The Examiner cites particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that, in preparing responses, the applicant fully considers the references in its entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or as disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Neil R. McLean whose telephone number is (571)270-1679. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:30AM-4:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on 571.272.7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Neil R. McLean/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/David K Moore/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625